

That guard the nation's homes from harm.
 Of a strong defense on land and sea—
 Flag of our country, flag of the free!
 We see in the flag a union grand,
 A brotherhood of heart and hand,
 A pledge of love and a stirring call
 To live our lives for the good of us all—Help-
 ful and just and true to thee, Flag of
 our country, flag of the free!
 Flutter, dear flag, o'er the lands and seas!
 Fling out your stars and your stripes to the
 breeze, Righting all wrongs, dispelling
 all fear,
 Guarding the land that we cherish so dear,
 And the God of our fathers, abiding
 with thee, Will
 bless you and trust you, O flag of the free!

IOWA ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, today I would like to take a moment to recognize a group of Iowans who distinguished themselves in their service on behalf of the security of the United States. Troop C, 1-113 Cavalry, of the Iowa Army National Guard, brought honor to itself and the State of Iowa while serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Troop C entered the Iraq theater of operations on October 30, 2005, and completed its mission on October 30, 2006.

Troop C, 1-113 Cavalry was based at Camp Ashraf in the Diyala Province of Iraq. Diyala is one of the most contested provinces in Iraq, and the mission of Troop C, 1-113 Cavalry was to provide perimeter defense at Camp Ashraf, reconnaissance and security patrols, improvised explosive device clearance missions, and convoy escorts. Troop C missions were conducted in such contested cities as Baghdad, Baqubah, and Khalis, as well as anywhere else required. Dangerous does not quite capture the situations that Troop C faced on a daily basis.

During this tour of duty, Troop C, 1-113 Cavalry conducted more than 3,000 missions, drove in excess of 150,000 miles on treacherous Iraqi roads, sustained over 50 improvised explosive device strikes, discovered more than 25 emplaced improvised explosive devices and provided security while these devices were destroyed; and on a routine basis conducted security missions to Ashraf's West Water Pump Station. Troop C put themselves in harm's way to ensure continual water supply to Ashraf and the surrounding villages. For its actions while performing these missions, Troop C has earned to date eleven Purple Hearts and nearly one-hundred combat action badges.

Battlefield success came at a price. SGT Dan L. Sesker made the ultimate sacrifice, giving his life while conducting a convoy operation in Baghdad.

On May 29, 2006, members of Troop C arrived on scene immediately after 4th Infantry Division Soldiers and a Columbia Broadcasting System news crew were attacked while conducting Memorial Day interviews. The soldiers of Troop C heroically took up the secu-

rity mission and provided first aid to the wounded Soldiers and news crew. The treatment provided to the correspondent, Kimberly Dozier, saved her life.

Troop C, 1-113 Cavalry deserves the highest praise of this body and the entire Nation. The courage, selfless sacrifice, and dedication to their mission displayed by Troop C exemplifies what is best in our brave soldiers and I am very proud to call them fellow Iowans. It is to the valor of those in Troop C and others like them past and present that we Americans owe our freedom and security today.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, over half a century ago, in *Brown v. Board of Education*, a unanimous Supreme Court struck down laws requiring racial segregation in our public schools. Yesterday's decision limiting voluntary efforts to desegregate public schools is false to Brown's promise of equality by making it far more difficult for local school boards to bring students of different races together in the classroom.

The landmark decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* called on us to honor not only the requirements of the Constitution but also of our consciences. America was made stronger as a result. Although the *Brown* decision initially met with intense resistance in many parts of the country, it eventually came to be recognized as one of the Court's finest hours.

Yesterday's decision, however, makes it far more difficult to achieve equal educational opportunity for children of all races. *Brown* was a giant step in ending racially segregated public schools, but achieving integration takes more than a court decision. It takes good will, vision, creativity, common sense, and a firm commitment to the goal of educating all children, regardless of race. Above all, it takes a realistic assessment of local communities to determine what will work to bring students together.

That challenge is difficult to meet, because in many parts of the Nation, neighborhoods continue to be highly segregated by race and national origin. Without specific efforts by local school boards to promote diversity, public schools often reflect the same racial segregation as the neighborhoods around them. As over 500 prominent social scientists who have studied residential segregation explained in their brief in the *Seattle and Jefferson County, KY*, cases, without voluntary efforts, neighborhood schools cannot achieve the integration that we as a society recognize is so important.

The benefits of integration, both for individual students and for society, are enormous. Children who participate in classes attended by students of many races enjoy greater parental involvement in public schools, and greater cross-cultural understanding. It helps

close the racial gap in education by helping African-American children achieve greater academic success. One of the Nation's leading conservative judges, Alexander Kozinski, described Seattle's integration plan as an "eminently sensible" "stirring of the melting pot," which helps children learn to interact as citizens of our common society. Without integrated schools, children will not learn these important lessons. That's a result we cannot afford.

Local school boards such as Jefferson County's have transcended the legacy of Jim Crow segregation to achieve not only enhanced opportunities for students but greater cooperation, participation, and genuine friendship between children of different races. We should honor that achievement. We should also ensure that school districts such as Jefferson County's, that do not want to return to the days of all-White and all-Black schools, receive the support and information needed to continue that success.

The Court's ruling undermines the important goal of racial integration by ignoring the real world consequences of its decision. Ironically, Chief Justice Roberts, who helped form the majority on this decision, stated at his confirmation hearing that this was something he would not do.

My first question to John Roberts at his confirmation hearing was about *Brown v. Board of Education*. I asked whether he agreed that the Court in *Brown* properly based its opinion on "real world consideration[s] . . . at the time of its decision." "Certainly, Senator," he responded, "you have to look at the discrimination in the context in which it is occurring."

Yet his plurality opinion in yesterday's decision ignores the context of *Brown* that Chief Justice Roberts said at his hearing was so important. In fact, Chief Justice Roberts would have gone even further than a majority of the Court and argued to outlaw virtually any use of race in voluntary efforts to integrate public schools.

The central tragedy in *Brown* was society's abandonment of African-American children to second-class schools. Every child relegated to such schools is harmed. Chief Justice Roberts' opinion disregards that reality by defining the only harm in *Brown* as the consideration of race in assigning children to school. The harm to these children is not less just because their segregation is the result of housing patterns rather than discriminatory laws. The cruel irony of the Chief Justice's view is that it would undermine *Brown* by ensuring that thousands of minority children would continue to attend segregated schools. Fortunately, a majority of the Supreme Court understood that we cannot afford to ignore the harm to students in segregated schools.

Despite professing moderation and promising to uphold precedent, the Court's newest members have already voted to radically limit the Clean Water Act. They have argued that the